BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, R. C. A.
25 EAST 22nd STREET, NEW YORK

Church Union News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee

of the

South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. II MARCH 1932 No. 5

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	EDITORIALS	... 161
2.	ARTICLES Intercommunion	... 167
3.	BOOK REVIEWS	... 194
4.	CLIPPINGS	... 195

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras

1932

THE

Christian Literature Society for India

POST BOX 501, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

The Christian Literature Society take pleasure in announcing that the Tamil and Telugu Editions of the Scheme of Union are now available at 4 annas per copy subject to the usual 25% discount to Missionaries and Ministers. Postage extra. They also wish to announce that the Tamil and Telugu editions of the 'Scheme of Union Explained' may now be obtained at the reduced price of 2 annas a copy nett.

SPECIAL INTERCESSION
AND
PRAYERS FOR UNITY

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs 2-8-0 per 100

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS REV. J. S. M. HOOPER, M.A.

REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D.

(*Managing Editor.*)

Publishers

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

Vol. II **MARCH 1932** **No. 5**

Editorials

The Episcopal Synod and General Council

It will give all friends of the Church Union Movement just cause for rejoicing to learn that the Episcopal Synod and the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon which met in Calcutta early in February have voted 'General Approval' to the Proposed Scheme of Union of Churches in South India and that this Council directs its delegates to continue the negotiations noting certain instructions that are laid down in the resolution. The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon by this action becomes the first body to give approval to the Scheme. Neither the S.I.U.C., nor the Wesleyan Church have as yet taken such action though the actions that they have taken imply that they will in due course give such formal approval. At present they have rather been giving instructions to their representatives to try to bring about a clearer understanding with reference to certain details, but the very fact that they have given such instructions implies that they do approve in general of the movement, but that they have not found it convenient as yet to express such a

formal decision, but rather wish to wait until the approval shall not be merely 'general' or 'formal' but both hearty and final. This action of the General Council, however, marks a definite step in the negotiations.

The approval of the Episcopal Synod of a limited amount of intercommunion will very greatly hearten those who are taking part in these negotiations. Both the Wesleyan Church and the S.I.U.C. had formerly voted to ask the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon to give permission for general intercommunion among the members of the negotiating Churches. The Episcopal Synod found it impossible to grant any such general permission as there are many in the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon as well as in the general Anglican Fellowship who would not approve of such a movement. They still hold very strongly that intercommunion must be the goal and not the means of union. The bishops gathered together in this Synod must have gone into the matter very thoroughly and very earnestly and it speaks well for their deep consecration to the cause that even those who felt they themselves could not conscientiously give permission for such intercommunion were willing to give liberty to those who felt that they desired to do so. All of course know that there are within the Church of England different groups of people with very different principles on this subject. Many have for a long time felt that they were doing their consciences serious offence by not being able to partake of communion in other Churches. They remained obedient to the law of their Church and refrained from such action but they did it in obedience to a law and almost in disobedience to their consciences. It is well therefore that those whose consciences feel that the law is right and must be obeyed, should give this permission to others who feel that there is a higher spiritual law which they ought to obey. We cannot but believe that God will pour out His blessing when men have thus subordinated their own highest beliefs to what seems to be the manifest leading of His Own Spirit. It calls for consecration on the part of all of us that we all should again seek further guidance even at the cost of giving up past traditions in the hope that the Spirit of God will Himself lead us into the union that He desires, and this applies not only to one side but to all of us.

The Eucharist

We are glad to be able to publish in this number a series of articles on the Eucharist. The basis of the articles is the Conference that was held in Oxford some months ago where some members of the Church of England got together and, though differing radically in many aspects of the doctrines associated with the Eucharist, did agree on certain resolutions

with reference to that Sacrament. Copies of those resolutions were sent to certain individuals and they were asked to give their comment with reference to them and we now publish several articles which give the views of different individuals with regard to these resolutions and to the Lord's Supper in general. It cannot but help all of us to learn more fully and more clearly the views of other Christians who are as fully consecrated and as scholarly as we are but who differ from us with reference to some of these most important elements in our Christian heritage. Here too there is need for divine guidance. Let us not be too certain of what we now believe or what our fathers believed but let us make sure that we are in fellowship with the divine and in such an attitude of mind and heart the Spirit Himself can lead us.

Intercommunion: Means or Goal

A great deal is being said these days with reference to the place that intercommunion should hold in the negotiations for union. The Eastern Churches hold very strongly to the position that there can be no intercommunion until the Western Churches have accepted the seven Sacraments, the placing of tradition alongside of the Scriptures as authoritative in our Christian life, and until there has been a unification in the ministry which can be recognised by all. There are also many in the Anglican Fellowship who hold very strongly to the same position. Perhaps no one has expounded this more clearly than the Bishop of Gloucester who is taking such a prominent part in the negotiations for union with both the West and East.

In the Free Churches, however, there is a multitude of men who hold equally strongly that intercommunion is the way to union and that therefore we cannot afford to wait until we have become one before we approach the Lord's Table together. The strongest exponents of this position are perhaps Dr. Peter Ainslie of Baltimore, U.S.A., and the Christian Unity League which he has organized. This League is sponsoring gatherings in the various parts of the United States and Canada where members and ministers of the various Churches get together for a week-end and join together in the Lord's Supper celebrated by ministers of different denominations. They definitely and deliberately advocate intercommunion as the way to Church Union.

There is no question but that this matter requires deeper consideration and fuller exchange of opinion than has as yet taken place. Those who agree with Dr. Ainslie cite the fact that in every case, where there has been union, it has been preceded by intercommunion on the part of the members and ministers of those Churches before union actually took place. It

is of course true that in all unions that have taken place there has been no difficulty about the recognition of the ministry, as up to the present no Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Churches have united.

It can also be said that some, who hold there should be no intercommunion until after union has been effected, fear that if intercommunion is permitted before union those who do not have episcopal ministries will not wish to have such ministries after union and that even those who now have episcopal ministries will recognise through personal experience that there is no difference in the blessing received at the Communion Table, whether the celebrant is episcopally ordained or not. These persons are perhaps 'pragmatists' in a realm where some will not admit that we can apply practical experiments to spiritual truths. However, in this age of Science there must be many persons who cannot by any possible metaphysical consideration be led to believe that these abstract historical traditions are of any value unless they can be proved by actual experience. It is always a valid question to ask whether those who hold a certain theory have really investigated the opposite and know by actual experience that it is not true, and the Free Churchman may perhaps say to the Episcopalian 'I have tried both and know there is no difference. You have only tried one and therefore cannot be certain of the other'.

We know that we are treading on sacred ground when we deal with this matter. We do believe in science and we also most sincerely believe in loyalty to conscience. But we also cannot refrain from believing that conscience depends very largely upon environment and that therefore we owe it to ourselves as well as those around us to educate our consciences and give God free play in them. We can never forget that Paul was true to his conscience when he was persecuting the Church. How can I know that I am true to God's best and highest plans for me unless I am willing to submit my conscience to His guidance? That guidance surely has manifested itself not merely in *my* forefathers but also in those of other groups and other countries. Again there is a call for the deepest consecration, the broadest consultation, and the most earnest searchings of heart.

J. J. B.

The Cathedral Sermon

At the request of the Metropolitan of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the Rev. John J. Banninga, D. D., of the South India United Church preached in the Cathedral at Calcutta on January 31, 1932. The request was issued in conformity with the decision of the Lambeth Conference that where negotiations for union are taking place there shall be

an exchange of pulpits so that the members of the negotiating Churches may become better acquainted with each other's life and thought.

The service at Calcutta was in connection with the holding of the Episcopal Synod and the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. There were present at the service not only twelve bishops of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon and one bishop of the Jacobite Church but also an audience that filled the Church to its utmost capacity. The fact that this was the opening service of these important meetings and that so many visiting bishops would be present naturally drew a large audience. In his sermon Dr. Banninga presented some of the fundamental principles of Church Union as set forth in Paul's letter to the Ephesians, Chapter 4: 13, and tried to show how we must transcend the laws of our Churches and rise to the higher spiritual principles which Christ embodied in His Church. Through the kindness of the Secretary, Church Union Committee, 19 Cubbon Road, Bangalore, a synopsis of this sermon has been published in pamphlet form and may be obtained from her.

Notes on Proposed Scheme by Rev. Principal Martin, of Edinburgh

1. *P.* 4. *Last clause of note.*—Is it wise, or really sufficient, to put this proviso negatively? Would it not be better to read 'provided that such statements be in harmony with the truths of our religion as revealed in the Holy Scriptures'?

2. *P.* 7. *Last lines of para.* 1.—'Shall be at liberty to receive' etc., suggests the *removal of an inhibition;* but am I wrong in thinking that what is intended is the *conferring of a right*? In this case it would be necessary to read 'shall have the right to receive'.

3. *P.* 18(6).—What exactly is the significance of 'Used as the basis of *part of* the necessary instruction'? Why not 'the basis of the necessary instruction'?

4. *P.* 22, *last lines.*—Is not this a *very* large power and responsibility to leave in the hands of one man? He cannot, of course, take the bishops with him, for that would include the 'delinquent', nor the Synod at that stage. But would he not feel relieved, and would it not add to the likelihood of his taking the action he will naturally be inclined to shirk, if he were enjoined to take with him, say the three next senior bishops, or one or two others selected somehow?

5. *P.* 31(*B*) (1) *2nd sentence, and p.* 41 (6).—With regard to these Dr. Martin asks whether the liberty given to Diocesan Councils to determine certain matters in their constitutions, especially in matters of discipline, may not lead to a very undesirable variety of constitutional method

and practice in the different councils. (With regard to this I explained that in the present S.I.U.C. liberty is given to Councils to frame their own rules, as uniformity would not be desirable or even possible, but that draft rules must be submitted to the General Assembly for approval. I suggested that the same procedure be followed in our case, and to this Dr. Martin agreed.—*J. H. M.*)

6. *P.* 34(4) (*a*) *3rd para.*—Will there be a power of appeal from the Council to the Synod? Are the rights of minorities or of an aggrieved individual, safeguarded, or must the decision of the Council be taken as final?

Seeking a Larger Church Union in India

(Christian Century, dated January 6, 1932)

Even in the midst of the disturbed political situation, it is evident that the movement toward Christian unity in India is making progress. Recently, and most significantly, this movement has grown too large to be comprehended within the proposals for the formation of a united Church of South India. Churches and missions of many Protestant complexions at work in North India have demanded that there be a united Church for the entire country. As a result, representatives of both North and South India met in Nagpur in November and *unanimously*—the word requires italic type—adopted a series of resolutions to govern the future writing of formal instruments of union. When it is said that these representatives included Baptists, Quakers, Wesleyan Methodists, American Methodists, members of the United Church of Northern India and the South India United Church, and Anglicans, the importance of this achievement will be clear. The crucial resolutions read:

> That with regard to the type of organization that may ultimately prove acceptable for a united Church of India, this conference records its opinion that this would be found through the general adoption of a constitutional episcopate responsible to representative assemblies and synods, in a form that would comprehend, so far as practicable, the advantages of the episcopal, presbyterian and congregational modes of government.
>
> In resolution number five, the phrase, 'A constitutional episcopate', is not used as a synonym for the historic episcopate.

With Baptists and Quakers ready to enter negotiations on a predetermined basis of this sort, it is clear that the western churches are likely soon to be faced with a challenge to their own inertness even more important than has been the challenge implied in the South India proposals.

Articles

Is Intercommunion the Goal or the means of the Union Movement?

To this question there are persons in the Free Churches who would answer—the Goal; the majority would reply—the Means. The Lambeth Conference answered—the Goal. A deeper question lies behind: *Is the Church—the Body of believers in Christ—to be thought of first as God's instrument through which He works in the world, to which He adds individuals? Or is it rather the aggregation of individual believers whom God has called through many means and many persons into a spiritual company which He alone can fully recognize?*

To answer either of these questions in the affirmative is not to deny a complementary truth in the other answer. It is a question of emphasis. Which comes first in God's plan? Those who think of the Church as coming first will differ in their view of the ministry and of the sacraments, from those who look first at the individual believer. But there are as a matter of fact many varieties of emphasis on both sides.

(1) On the Church side there are those who hold a rigid view of Apostolical Succession. Christ called his apostles and gave them full authority in the Church: and they appointed their successors and so on. The authority was passed on in this line and nowhere else. But it is limited by the doctrine and practice of the Church as a whole, and no one claims that on the strength of this a Bishop (for instance) 'can do just what he likes.' The Pope is not 'infallible' except when speaking *ex cathedra*. In the Anglican Church the Report of the Conference of Bishops at Lambeth is fully criticised and nothing is binding unless adopted by the Governing Council of a Province of the Church.

(2) Others again lay little stress on the individual succession; it is the succession of office. Throughout the centuries God has called and the Church has ordained men to do the same things and to bear the same responsibilities and it is right to carry on that custom. That is the way the Lambeth Conference speaks of the Historic Episcopate. It raises no questions about the possibility of God providing other methods or about His using other ministers at different junctures in the history of the Church. It holds to the historic method as proved by experience of God's working and as obviously on many practical grounds the most likely way of securing worldwide union; and it leaves people free to adopt particular interpretations of it, as in fact they do in the Anglican Church.

(3) In the non-Episcopal Churches also there are different grades of thinking. Some would have no special ministry; others ordain men to particular congregations and their ministry falls into abeyance when they cease to minister in a particular congregation. In some the congregation sets apart the minister: in others the minister is ordained in a regular succession of ordinations by ministers. The Churches negotiating union in S. India have maintained the ordination of ministers by ministers and have committed to them the ministry of the Word and sacraments. All the uniting Churches in S. India are agreed that the normal custom should be that the minister of the sacraments should be an ordained minister.

The recognition of the Ministry of other Churches

Here again there is considerable difference.

(1) The most rigid Church is the Roman but it recognises within its own borders the Uniat (Greek) Churches which acknowledge the authority of the Pope.

(2) The Greek Church is slow to allow ministers or communicants of other Churches to officiate or communicate in its own Churches; but it has lately been permitting its own communicants to attend Anglican Communions in places where they have no clergy of their own.

(3) The Anglican Church enjoins its own people to use the ministrations of their own Church and formally acknowledges for itself the traditional ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. But it has never pronounced on the ministries of the Reformed Churches. There have been instances in its history when it has accepted *e. g.*, Presbyterian ministers without reordination and at times, *e.g.*, under the Test Acts, it acquiesced in occasional conformity by persons who habitually attended other Churches. It has however consistently maintained the principle that its own people should use the ministry and sacraments of their own Church wherever these are available. But that there has been a considerable divergence between principle and practice cannot be denied, and it is partly due to the much abused establishment of the Churches in England and Scotland, for the King himself is Head in the Church both in England and in Scotland.

Spiritual effectiveness of Ministries

It is often thought that the rule of the Anglican Church involves a denial of the spiritual effectiveness of the ministries of other Churches. This is, of course, not the case. The Prayer Book expressly says that what it prescribes is not in condemnation of other nations. The Ordinal only speaks of the Church of England when it lays down that no one shall be

accounted a Bishop, Priest or Deacon *in the Church of England* unless he has been ordained in the form in use in the Church of England or has previously had episcopal consecration or ordination. The definition of the ministry of the Church in the Articles is entirely general and is as a matter of fact taken almost entirely from the Confession of Augsburg. But more positively than this the Lambeth Conference has twice said 'that these (non-Episcopal) ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace'.

Why then do any hesitate to use these ministries?

Leaving aside all other questions, we think only of reunion.

In practical language reunion depends on a universally recognised ministry through the whole Church. How shall it be secured? The practical way appears to be through the continuance of the Historic Episcopal ministry. This is the contribution the Anglican Church has to bring to the cause of union. In one direction it has been effective in drawing old Catholics and Greeks into nearer fellowship with the Anglican Church: in another it has held together in organic unity the Anglican Church spread all over the world, not only in the British Empire but in other lands as well and it has been adopted in the Union Scheme as the most promising means of union.

But if union is our goal, is it wise and right to encourage the maintenance of separate ministries? Almost all would reply no! But when two Churches working for union have reached a measure of agreement, what then? The Union Scheme recognises that all the ministries of the uniting Churches shall, without any suggestion of mutual reordination, be the ministers of the united Church. So far, the fact of union has abolished any difference there might have been before, (always allowing individuals to use ministries according to their conscience and compelling none).

Practically all would agree that there comes a time in the negotiations when union is so nearly achieved, that its final results may be anticipated and any who desire it may use the ministries of any of the uniting Churches.

There was a difference of opinion in the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon as to what that stage should be. Some thought it should be a more or less formal acceptance of the Scheme by the Churches, others thought that the amount of agreement reached now was sufficient. In this connection it is worth while considering the implications of intercommunion after the union is accomplished. As each uniting Church brings into the united Church its present fellowship with other Churches, it follows that the communicants of those Churches will

be able to communicate in any church of the United Church and their ministers will, if requested to do so, be able to minister in the United Church, keeping only such rules as the United Church enacts for its own ministers. It follows that the union will mean a tremendous widening of Church fellowship throughout India.

These things are put down here to shew that whatever hesitation was felt in the Episcopal Synod was not due to any desire to narrow the terms of union already agreed upon. The question was what is right at the present time?

The non-Episcopal Churches negotiating union had asked that there should be special intercommunion in meetings of the Joint Committee and in Conferences organised by it.

And the answer turned on the question what was wise and right at this stage.

How far are all the Churches committed to union?

If all are definitely determined and say so, the difficulty felt is slight. But if there could be any suggestion of a breakdown, would the principle of the universally recognised ministry have become hopelessly fogged? Rightly or wrongly, the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon stands for the principle that a corporate union can only be accomplished through a universally recognised ministry. And on that foundation it has begun the formal process of enacting the measures which will allow its own Dioceses in the south to join the Union.

Another question which has to be asked is of lesser importance but it cannot be ignored.

What effect would such action have on those who now support the union?

First we have to think of those who are members of the Anglican delegation. They have not been asked individually. Would they be put in an intolerable position and the delegation divided? The Scheme provides that no one's conscience shall be forced after union: would this be a practical forcing of conscience before union? Would it drive out of the Committee any who felt that they ought not to do it? And again what would be the effect on the acceptance of the scheme by the many Anglicans in India and outside it, who are watching keenly and hopefully? That it would alienate some is certain: that others would rejoice is equally certain. But it drives the division right down into the heart of the Church just when it is most of all desirable that all should be united in seeking for union. There may be many who will feel that this is unworthy of the cause. If a thing is right, it should be done regardless of consequences. Yet we are told to be wise as well as harmless. But let us put it on a higher level,

There do come times when the Spirit of God is manifestly work and His Presence is almost palpably felt. The Joint Committee has time and again experienced this and many would desire to focus this unity in the Presence of God in the Sacrament of Communion. Such occasions know no law and it was lest such experiences should be blurred that whatever their views might be there was no suggestion in the Episcopal Synod that those who felt so impelled should be condemned, if they translated their experience into action in the way suggested.

It was the desire to consummate that experience in a united Sacrament that led to the suggestion of a joint celebration of the Communion by ministers of the three Churches. Of course, some may say that that is a mere subterfuge. All one can say is that what was asked was that in some way the wonderful spiritual unity achieved at these meetings should be made explicit. Other answers would have left out some members: this answer would almost certainly include all. And the spiritual unity would be shared in the most sacred service.

Whatever be the outcome of this question we ask all to remember that it is not due to lack of love that any hesitate: it is due to a sincere desire to know what is the will of God: and above all we ask everyone to pray that the right decision may be made.

HARRY MADRAS

Intercommunion

At the Joint Committee and at Retreats organised by it in South India

The Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has received the request of the S.I.U. and Wesleyan Churches that in the meetings of the Joint Committee and in conferences organised directly by it, the members should be at liberty to unite in Communion services presided over by ministers of one or other of the uniting Churches. It is urged that the omission of this final act of fellowship is a serious stumbling block to the negotiations and that if such united communions were made possible, the success of the negotiations would be materially advanced.

It must be at once explained that this request raises the most difficult problem which has yet come before our Church in these negotiations: if compliance would help the uniting Churches, it would alienate the sympathy of many in the Anglican Communion who definitely consider the

interchanging of ministries of separated Churches to be wrong in any circumstances whatever. Indeed it has been found impossible for the Episcopal Synod and its assessors to come to a common mind on the subject.

The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has at its session of February 1932 given 'General approval' to the Scheme of Union; and we can therefore assure the Churches that our hesitation in acceding to their request implies no wavering about the Scheme. 'General approval' is the first formal step in the stages of its adoption by our Church and that step was taken with only two dissentient votes. In the Scheme thus generally approved it is provided that all the ministers of the uniting Churches shall be ministers of the United Church, and this hesitation must not be taken to imply any drawing back from any of the statements agreed upon by the Scheme, which the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has by its resolution generally approved. Nor does the hesitation imply that the Synod does not fully acknowledge the manifest spiritual gifts which attend the ministries of other Churches.

The doubt concerns the wisdom of this method of trying to further union and the question of putting stumbling blocks in the way of those whose consciences are unable to approve the interchanging of ministries of separated Churches. Organically the union of Churches can only be effected by the unification of their ministries: and union cannot be achieved so long as separately organised Churches are determined to continue separate ministries. It is for that reason that many Anglicans are unable to use the ministries of other Churches, while not denying that God is working in and through them in their Churches. They believe that by doing so they would be helping to perpetuate separation. As it is a foundation principle of the union that liberty of conscience must be given to all, the Synod feels that it cannot issue any instruction in this matter to its delegates.

There are however two factors in the present situation which have weighed strongly with the Synod.

There do come occasions in great spiritual movements when the presence of God's Spirit is realised in a very special measure, and the Synod rejoices that that has been the experience of the Joint Committee. It desires greatly that nothing which it may do shall in any way blur that experience or hinder its working. And it is in that setting that it has anxiously explored every possibility.

There is a further point which the Synod has most anxiously considered. It is eager to hasten the time when intercommunion may be achieved. The majority considers that when all the Churches are pledged to complete the union and substantial agreement on fundamental matters has been reached by the three negotiating Churches and they are thus

pledged to put an end to the continuance of separated ministries, the results of a formally achieved union may on special occasions be enjoyed by anticipation. And further, though the Synod is unable formally to endorse the procedure asked for, because it is one on which the Church of this Province has not yet reached a common mind, a majority of the Synod is unwilling to limit the liberty of the delegates in this matter or to call in question the action of any who feels impelled, in view of the agreement already reached and in confident expectation that full agreement will be attained, to join in the Lord's Supper celebrated by ministers of the other uniting Churches at meetings of the Joint Committee and Retreats organised directly by it. In giving this liberty the Synod would emphasise the fact that it cannot believe that general intercommunion before union is the right way of working for unity: and further it asks the other Churches not to misunderstand the attitude of those who even on these special occasions do not feel that they can depart from their lifelong rule.

Because we feel that such intercommunion may still be only partial and that all will not feel free in this way to consummate that spiritual nearness to God which is so marked a feature of its gatherings the Synod considered another method of achieving that end; namely that if representative ministers of all three Churches joined in celebrating the communion on the occasions referred to in the last paragraph (together leading in the essential parts of the service) the desired object would be attained. The proposal was suggested by an old custom of the Church that on special occasions presbyters celebrated the Communion with the Bishop. This joining in the celebration would be a not inappropriate symbol of our oneness in the desire for union and in our approach to God; and it seems to many members of the Synod that this would be the truest and most fitting method of giving expression to that fellowship into which we are being led by the gracious wisdom of our Heavenly Father.

General Council 1932

General approval of Union in South India

1. The General Council of The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon humbly renders thanks to Almighty God for the continued influence of His Holy Spirit in the negotiations for union of the Churches in South India and for the definite advance towards union that has been made during the last two years. Having received the opinion of the Lambeth

Conference, and its replies to the questions submitted to it by the General Council, and having considered the report of the meeting of the Joint Committee held in November 1930, under Chapter XLII Canon I of the Canons and Rules, the General Council gives general approval to the Scheme for the union of Churches in South India, and directs its delegates to continue the negotiations, noting the instruction laid down in the following resolutions:

2. That the Council, believing that the real union of Churches can only be effected when every Church brings its full contribution into the united Church and has full opportunity to teach what it believes to be true, instructs its delegates to endeavour to secure that the Constitution of the united Church shall provide,

(*a*) that the teaching office of the Bishops shall be declared to include their responsibility of stating as necessity arises what the faith of the Church has always been, both in the exercise of their ministry in their several dioceses and as a body in published statements issued from time to time, after consultation with presbyters, in accordance with rules laid down by the Synod of the united Church;

(*b*) that it is one of the special functions of presbyters to declare God's message of pardon to penitent sinners.

3. That the Council instructs its delegates to bring to the notice of the Joint Committee the advice of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference (p. 127, clause (4)) with regard to confirmation as expressing its own mind on the subject.

4. That this Council accepts the advice of the Lambeth Conference [pp. 128-9 (4) (a) & (b)] with regard to the participation by presbyters in the consecration of Bishops, and instructs its delegates to present that advice as representing the opinion of the Council which was asked for in Resolution 19 of the Joint Committee of November 1930.

Church Union in South India

Action of the South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church

The Synod met in Bangalore on January 27, 1932, reviewed the work of its Committee on Church Union, and passed resolutions. The Synod's Committee had met twice during the year, and presented its report, which was adopted.

The first subject dealt with in the report was the adoption of a brief summary of the most important parts of the proposed Scheme of Union in English to be translated into Tamil, Telugu, and Kanarese for the benefit of the members of the Wesleyan-Methodist Church, so that those who were not able to grasp the more technical parts of the Scheme may have a clear idea as to how union would affect them, if the Scheme were adopted. The summary was slightly modified and passed for translation, printing, and circulation.

A series of resolutions was adopted, thanking the Conference which met at Birmingham in 1931 for its sympathetic action regarding the South India Scheme, and a committee was appointed to correspond with the Missionary Society during the year regarding financial and administrative matters that must receive careful consideration before union can be consummated.

The report of the Conference held at Nagpur in November last was presented to the Synod, which realised its importance. Strong desires were expressed that in this question of union North and South India should, if possible, act on similar lines. It was felt that our Church in the North should be in full accord with our action in the South; and that our North India churches may be in full sympathy with the South India Scheme, and have firsthand knowledge of what is transpiring, it was resolved to ask the North India Provincial Synod to send representatives as visitors to the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

The Church of India, Ceylon, and Burma is apparently desirous that Ceylon should join with the South India Church, and as our Church in Ceylon will be involved, it was resolved to ask the Ceylon Provincial Synod to send representatives as visitors to the next meeting of the Joint Committee, so that they may have intimate knowledge of what is done by that Committee.

As the Joint Committee on Church Union will meet during the year, fifteen delegates were appointed, and these will represent the views of the Synod on matters that will arise for discussion.

The question of intercommunion between the consulting Churches was again considered, and the unanimous opinion was that such corporate acts of worship would very greatly help the consultations and prepare the Churches for union. A copy of the resolution with a letter of greeting to the General Synod and Council, meeting in Calcutta, was sent to the Metropolitan.

The Synod appointed its Committee to watch developments and to take such action as it may deem necessary during the year.

H. GULLIFORD

Eucharistic Unity

Agreed Statement of Anglican Belief

As a result of a Conference of Catholics and Evangelicals, held under the Chairmanship of the Master of the Temple, a document concerning Eucharistic belief was drawn up and, with the approval of the Archbishop of York, circulated for signature among representative clergy and signed by more than one hundred of them.

The object was 'to prove to the world that the Church of England is *not* "hopelessly divided within itself"; to show that reconciliation is possible, and that our underlying unity is far greater than our differences; and to stimulate the right sort of controversy, and to discourage the wrong, which begins by failing even in the wish to understand what others think and feel and mean.'

The statement is as follows:—

Eucharistic Doctrine

Acknowledging that, inasmuch as God is Love, the Life of God the Son, alike in the eternal sphere and in its earthly manifestation, is a life of self-giving to the Father, we believe:

(1) That our Lord, on the eve of His Passion, instituted the Sacrament of Holy Communion in remembrance of Himself and for the special commemoration of his Death, and that the Church has therefore been right in regarding the Eucharist as the most sacred act in her worship;

(2) that the Lord, Who has promised to abide for ever with His Church, is Himself the real Minister in every Sacrament, using by the operation of the Holy Spirit the visible acts and audible words of an earthly minister;

(3) that the Consecration is the Act of the unseen Lord, in response to the liturgical prayer and action, taken as a whole, in which the officiating priest and the worshippers alike have their share;

(4) that such Consecration has a real effect, since the consecrated Elements are, by the Will of God, now charged with a new spiritual significance and purpose, being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ;

(5) that, while the Consecration passes into effect in virtue of the Divine Will and the intention of the Church as a whole, the benefit of reception is dependent upon the faith and dispositions of the worshipper;

(6) that the Divine Liturgy constitutes one whole, in which the reception of the sacred Elements forms an essential part;

(7) that the Celebration of the Liturgy shows forth our Lord's Sacrifice as that which has, once for all, reconciled the world to God;

(8) that our Lord's Sacrifice, which reached its climax at Calvary, was completed by His Resurrection and Ascension, whereby His incarnate life was carried forward into the unveiled Presence of the Father, thus establishing a new relation of mankind to God;

(9) that the virtue of our Lord's Sacrifice was made available for us through the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, when the Church became the agent of His redemptive purpose;

(10) that as the Risen and Ascended Christ is ever with the Father as the Royal High-Priest of mankind, so at the Lord's Table we celebrate and make before the Divine Majesty the Memorial which He has willed, becoming thus united with our Lord in His Sacrifice, which sustains the new moral and spiritual order prepared for redeemed humanity; and we affirm that the faithful use of the Lord's Supper can alone reveal its inexhaustible meaning, and that in the unity of experience we shall draw nearer to unity in belief.

Leading Article from 'The Church Times'

There has been released for publication this week a document on the subject of Eucharistic doctrine which we understand to have been for some time in private circulation. The signatures appended to it are not so much remarkable for their number as for the exceptional diversity of the views which their owners represent. They include the names of several prominent Evangelicals, of a number of well-known Catholic scholars and priests, and of Canon C. E. Raven. If there is any substantial ground of unity in sacramental doctrine between the widely advertised revolutionary propaganda of the last-named and the more conventional beliefs of most of the remainder, we may indeed thank God for the discovery and take courage for the future of the Church of England.

The Statement was drawn up by a group of persons as the outcome of a conference held at King's College, London, last autumn. It is now published, we are informed, with three definite objects: first, to show that the Church of England is not so hopelessly divided within itself as interested parties are in the habit of maintaining; secondly, to prove that the underlying unity of different schools of Anglican thought and practice is in reality far greater than are the differences hitherto unreconciled between them; and thirdly, by making an effort to discover and understand the thoughts and meaning of opponents, to stimulate the right kind of discussion of the problems at issue, and to discourage controversy of the wrong kind. These objects are wholly laudable. It has long been our conviction

that a great part of Anglican controversies is due to misunderstandings and suspicions which a little charity and a little knowledge might remove, and that the progress of familiar study of the Church's teaching, in loyal devotion to its principles, would prove the existence of a profound unity between Church of England people belonging to schools of thought which are superficially in strong opposition to one another.

We are thankful to record that this conviction is strengthened by the impressions derived from a perusal of the present document. Certain criticisms or qualifications require to be made in our acceptance of its terms; but it is only with satisfaction that we can regard its general tenor. If, as we have already suggested, it is possible to regard all its signatories as consenting to the whole contents of the Statement, the lines of reconciliation between opposing schools are pretty clearly indicated, and the whole Church of England may be immensely thankful for its publication.

The views to which the Statement commits its supporters include, as a beginning, the assertion that the Sacrament of Holy Communion was instituted by our Lord Himself on the eve of His Passion for the special commemoration of His death. It may seem strange that such a simple fact should be received as matter of congratulation, but the times are such that Christ's institution of the Sacrament for this purpose is sometimes denied even by dignitaries of the Church. No reconciliation is possible without admission of our Lord's institution of the rite. Next, it is admitted in the Statement that the real minister in every Sacrament is Christ Himself, acting by the operation of the Holy Spirit through the visible acts of an earthly minister; and that the consecration of the Eucharist takes effect in virtue of the will of God and the general intention of the Church, and not of the mere faith or dispositions of the worshipper, whch are, however, the conditions of his receiving the benefits of the Sacrament. All this is sound Catholic doctrine. That misunderstandings of its meaning have been so far removed as to allow of its acceptance by members of Evangelical groups, is a fact full of hope and promise, at which we heartily rejoice.

Not only does the Statement set forth a right doctrine of consecration, but also a true belief in the Eucharistic sacrifice. 'The celebration of the Liturgy,' it says, 'shows forth our Lord's sacrifice as that which has, once for all, reconciled the world to God.' It stresses the new relationship of mankind to God which was established by our Lord's Ascension into heaven. It states that the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost made the Church the agent of Christ's redemptive purpose, and made available to man the virtue of His sacrifice; and, perhaps most significantly of all, insists that the service of the altar is the memorial before the Divine Majesty which Christ has willed us to make, and that through its celebration the faithful are united with our Lord in that sacrifice which sustains the new moral and spiritual order prepared for redeemed humanity. If all

this is the belief of Evangelicals, we can assure them that it is no less the Catholic Faith, and that in so far they and we are at one.

The points in which it is a somewhat ungrateful duty to criticise a document of so much merit are partly verbal and partly substantial. Even verbal points need to be scrutinized with extreme care in a Statement on which hopes of reconciliation are to be founded, and in which a basis of agreement between contrasted theories is to be sought. Thus we must take exception to the assertion that the sacrifice of Calvary was 'completed' by the Resurrection and Ascension. The Christian sacrifice is not completed at any point short of the feeding of the worshippers upon the Victim. This is one of the points brought out with such conciliatory firmness by the Bishop of Gibraltar in his important book, *The Fulness of Sacrifice*, in which he shows the application of the neglected but illuminating principles of sacrifice in general to the Cross of Christ and the Eucharistic Feast. Our criticism of the Statement is here probably one of terminology; but the terminology of a theological definition such as the present ought to be correct.

More serious is the assertion that the consecration of the Eucharist is the act of Christ 'in response to the liturgical prayer and action, taken as a whole'. Of course, this statement, taken precisely as it stands, is perfectly capable of defence. Our objection to it is precisely that in the present state of controversy it will never be taken as it stands, but that very undesirable implications will be read into it; and the promoters of the Statement ought to have provided against the inevitable misunderstanding of this clause. The Orthodox Church associates the act of consecration closely with the response of God to the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Elements. The Western Church, and therein the Church of England most decisively, attributes the definite consecration of the Elements to the recitation in the Name of Christ of His own words of institution.

If, in this world of time and space, the bread and wine of the Eucharist from being unconsecrated become consecrated, the element of time cannot be entirely excluded. If there is in any sense a change effected, as the present Statement allows, there is also a time at which that change occurs. Inevitably the clause from which we have quoted will be taken as committing its signatories to the view strongly supported by the text of the Revised Prayer Book, and no less strongly repudiated by the majority of English Catholics, that the moment of change ought to be dissociated as far as possible from the words of Christ, and left to the greatest possible extent vague and unspecified. We are certain that that is not the intention of some of the Catholic signatories to the Statement, and the public ought to be informed.

But the most serious difficulty of all arises, as is not surprising, over the treatment of the question of the effect of consecration. Clearly, it was

necessary, in a document designed to register agreement, to touch as lightly as might be on the subject of the Real Presence. It was antecedently probable that any agreed statement on this matter would, from the Catholic standpoint, err by deficiency. But quite certainly, in any statement intended for publication, it should have been made plain that Catholic belief goes further than some of the signatories drawn from other schools of thought were able to follow. Otherwise there is the certainty that less well-informed members of the public would infer and assume that Catholics are satisfied with what, in fact, they can only regard as a very incomplete statement of the subject; with the consequence of further misconception and recrimination later on.

It is simply and solely in order to minimize the danger of such misconception that we draw attention to the highly inadequate character of the clause in the Statement dealing with the consecrated Elements. The Statement says, with a rather unwise use of the word 'real', which in this connexion has a precise technical sense, that the consecration 'has a real effect, since the consecrated Elements are by the will of God now charged with a new spiritual significance and purpose, being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.' So far as they go, these words are literally true; but how inadequate they are to express the truth, perhaps only a Catholic can appreciate.

The significance and purpose of the consecrated Elements depend on what God has made the Elements to be; so far the Statement is on right lines. But to any one conversant with theology and religious history the ambiguity of the definition offered of their nature is patent. One party will accept the formula in one sense, another in its opposite. It belongs to that class of bridging formulæ which appear to join the two sides of a crevasse, and in fact will not bear the weight of a single passenger. Mere words will not create unity, but will rather engender strife. We must insist that when, in the effort to discover agreement, ambiguous formulæ have to be employed, candour and prudence alike require the addition of some statement of the disagreements which they also cover. We would not wish to see the last state of Eucharistic controversy rendered worse than the first.

Lessons from the Recent Anglican Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine

It seems to me that this Statement has both a direct value and importance for the Church of England, and also an indirect value for all who are seeking to advance in mutual understanding and towards full union.

Of its value to the Church of England I need say little. The list of signatories itself shows how successful it has been as a statement of

common beliefs held by those who differ considerably in practice and in doctrine. The adverse comments on it which I have seen both on the Evangelical and on the Anglo-Catholic side seem to me almost entirely such, as in a sense, really prove its success. On the one side some Evangelicals have pointed out that Anglo-Catholics could *bona fide* sign the statement and therewith retain all their special beliefs, and say that this has been possible through ambiguity of phrasing. I shall say something further on about the question of ambiguity, but now only note that, provided that there be no ambiguity, it is only what is expected and desired if people of different beliefs find themselves able to unite in such a statement. On the other side, some Anglo-Catholics have complained that particular points which they value were omitted. This is certainly the case, but does not alter the value of certain other truths being stated which they can hold in common with Evangelicals.

But I wish mainly to consider the statement as an example of the right method of dealing with doctrines when there are large differences of opinion between people, who yet wish to make clear what measure of unity they already enjoy and to extend that unity. Thank God, the importance and value of this method is being more and more fully realised nowadays, and to us in South India very much depends on it. In a larger sphere it was the great method which was used in the Faith and Order Conference at Lausanne and has been used since in the work that has followed that Conference.

The essential points of this method are:—

(*a*) That by careful and prayerful discussion those who differ should understand each other more fully, and thereby discover the truths which they hold in common but probably express in different terms.

(*b*) That they should at the same time understand clearly the limits of their agreement and the points on which they still differ.

The first danger to be guarded against in the preparation of any such statement, and one which is difficult to avoid, is ambiguity. The whole value of the method is spoiled if words and phrases are used to which different people attach different meanings. But here comes an important distinction—it is one thing to say that A and B attach different meanings to a certain phrase; it is quite a different thing to say that while A and B attach the same meaning to the phrase, they draw different inferences from it—or rather, to be precise, draw different inferences from it when they take it in connection with certain other presuppositions or beliefs of their own. The former is ambiguity and is harmful, the latter is legitimate and necessary. In my opinion, most of the complaints against the Eucharistic Statement on the score of ambiguity really mean the latter of the two things which I have distinguished, and are therefore unjustified. But I

may give for the sake of example a case of what seems to me a real ambiguity in this Statement. In para (4) it speaks of the consecrated elements as 'being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ'. Now this phrase the Evangelical will take as meaning simply and solely that they are outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual grace which our Lord described as His body and blood. But the Anglo-Catholic will take it as a further but essential part of its meaning that the elements may and should after consecration be described as themselves in a true sense the body and blood of Christ. This phrase therefore seems to me wrongly ambiguous, concealing real divergence of belief under one form of words.

On the other hand, take a phrase such as that in para (3)—'the Consecration is the Act of the unseen Lord'. This is a statement from which different people may draw different inferences when taken in conjunction with their other beliefs. Some will say that it follows that questions of ministerial order are at the least of entirely minor importance in the matter, and that the Church, or a particular section thereof, may freely permit laymen to celebrate the Holy Communion; while others will regard it as a precious truth which strengthens their sense of the importance of the ministerial office as they have historically received it. Such divergent inferences are natural and at our present stage inevitable, but do not at all lessen the value of the fact that both sides hold the truth expressed in those words.

I need not give further examples or attempt further to analyse this particular Statement. My special suggestion is that it is worth our study not only in itself, but as an example of what those who work for the union of the Churches must try to do over the whole range of faith and order. By observing whether a particular effort succeeds or whether it fails, whether it expresses true agreement or whether it merely hides divergence by ambiguous words, we can gain much in our own attempts of a similar nature.

One more important point should be noticed. Doubtless for good reasons, those who prepared this Statement endeavoured only to state their common beliefs, and did not, as at Lausanne, attempt also to state the points on which the difference of opinion or belief remained. The absence of the latter may, and I think has, led to misundersanding in some quarters of the purpose and the value of the Statement. In other analogous cases, it must always be considered whether or not any such statement of points of divergence should also be added. In the case of our own South India Scheme, I think it will be agreed that it would not be suitable to state points of divergence in a scheme of union, but it may and should be made plain that those who fully unite on a given statement may rightly have different opinions with regard to points which are not fully dealt with in that statement. But I believe this general principle is entirely understood

by all those who know of our scheme. We are endeavouring to work on the principle of 'In necessary points, unity; in doubtful points, liberty; in all things, charity', and one of our chiefest efforts at every stage must be to interpret and apply rightly the two words 'necessary' and 'unity'.

Bishopstowe,
Palamcottah,
12-11-1931.

FREDERICK TINNEVELLY.

What the 'Eucharist', or Lord's Supper, Means to Me

(By EMMONS E. WHITE).

In terming the Lord's Supper a Sacrament, it is in order for me to state my interpretation of 'sacrament'. To me it is any medium, personal or impersonal, by which man realizes the actual presence of God, is distinctly inspired to a higher level of moral living, or receives both their benefits interchangeably. From that standpoint 'every common bush aflame with God' is a sacrament; also every gorgeous sunset, strain of noble music, every lofty thought exquisitely expressed, the relationship of parent to child and of friend with friend, may be such a means of grace. It is in such high company and upon the highest seat in it that I place the Eucharist.

If my interpretation of the institution of the Lord's Supper as recorded in the New Testament be correct, it is primarily not a vehicle of special grace imparted under certain conditions unalterably adhered to, but is a service of *commemoration* instituted by our Lord himself, by which he sought to bind forever to himself the hearts of all his true followers in sacrificial service of God and man. The words, 'This do in remembrance of me' have called forth the love and loyalty of myriads in the past 1900 years. The bread and the wine are fitting symbols of his glorious death and, therefore, valuable aids to our perennial recollection of that death. To me there is something repugnant in the doctrine that the elements may actually be his physical body and blood, even for an instant. Nor do I conceive how my eating or drinking them would result in any moral or spiritual benefit, to myself or anyone else. But that Christ is spiritually and really present in the Sacrament, and that in it He continually seeks to win our ever deeper love and devotion to Himself and to His ideals, thereby saving us from the 'sin that doth so easily beset us,' I fully believe.

It now remains to indicate the place I give to *ritual* in this service. Despite whatever inferences may be drawn from John's Gospel, chapter 6, verses 52-59, I place relatively little value upon either the form or the order in which the Eucharist should be celebrated. The whole tendency of at least the Fourth Gospel appears to be dead-set against the crystallization of Christian thought and practice into any fixed 'deposit' of faith or ritual, of which not one jot or tittle may be altered. On the contrary, it stresses the view that the Lord's Supper originated as a simple farewell feast, wherein the attention of the disciples was drawn away from the mere bread and the cup of wine, from repetition of certain phrases, to the realm of the Timeless and the Unseen and of human personality. The disciples were summoned, not to preserve unaltered every word of institution, but to receive deep in memory the matchless personality of their Master and His loving spirit. Hence the simple scene in which Jesus washes the disciples' feet before the Supper, and those beautiful fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of John which have inexpressibly comforted and strengthened multitudes, even in their simplicity. But of the institution of a set order or ritual, by which alone this memorable occasion hereafter could be observed down through the centuries, or of what constitutes a 'valid sacrament', I for one can find no trace in the New Testament. All arrangements, therefore, which imply the absolute necessity of such order and ritual, without which the efficacy of the sacrament is even impaired or destroyed, seem to me a departure from the essence of true Christianity. 'It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing.'

My views on ritual in this connection issue in what to many may seem a most unorthodox belief regarding the *celebrant*. I am aware that many sincere Christians hold that the sacredness of the clerical office and the efficacy of the sacrament are not at all affected by any defect in the physical characteristics or the personal character of the celebrant. I cannot share this view. Granted that God often works marvellous deeds through the imperfect human instruments of His making. Granted, also, that in spite of blemishes in the human priest who celebrates the sacrament, the mysterious transforming touch of the Christ may, and *does*, operate in our hearts the while. Nevertheless it is my solemn belief that the inspiration and helpfulness of the service, for me, may be exceedingly marred or almost destroyed by certain jarring elements, chief among which is the knowledge, in some instances, that the celebrant before me is conspicuously lacking in sincerity or in Christian love. I would go even further and say that I regard the Lord's Supper as capable of being properly observed anywhere and at any time by any group of communicant members of a Church who are in good standing, without the assistance of a minister, or priest, who has been episcopally or non-episcopally ordained. It is the *occasion* itself which validates the ceremony used, and *not* the physical

conditions of its observance—such as, for example, the stipulation that either bread, or wafers, or wine or grape juice invariably must be used. At the same time I agree that it is generally expedient to preserve a certain amount of order and ritual, which have come down to us through a long and sacred history. But the united Church of the not-too-distant future should jealously be on its guard lest even these time-honoured rites should degenerate into rigid and meaningless formulæ.

Finally, I desire to express my honour for all sincere believers, whether they attach redemptive value to the precise historic forms in the Church, or whether they share my own views in the matter. And I crave for both types of belief, if found essential, a place in the Church Universal. It may be that out of a mutually appreciative union of this sort something higher and more distinctively Christian will arise. It is in the earnest hope that this higher *inclusiveness* of spirit will be realized, that I approach eagerly the proposed union of the episcopal and non-episcopal Churches in South India.

October 13, 1931. EMMONS E. WHITE.

A Statement of Positive Value

The earliest Doctrinal Statements of the Church are the baptismal Creeds. These it will be noticed are entirely positive, containing no repudiations of the belief of others and admitting of a variety of interpretations. Early in the fourth century it was found necessary to define the doctrinal position of the orthodox Christian more carefully and creeds were drawn up with the deliberate purpose of excluding certain who held heretical views. The Nicene Creed of our Holy Communion Service is one of these. It was then found possible to define the Catholic faith with sufficient accuracy with the use of only one negative. Those however who drew up the confession of Faith commonly called the Athanasian Creed, somewhere about the fifth or sixth century, found it necessary to make a more liberal use of that little word 'not', and their example was followed by those responsible for the confessions of the sixteenth century. These confessions were put forward by those who had thrown off their allegiance to Rome and at the same time wished to disown many of the beliefs and superstitions of the mediæval Church. From the nature of the case therefore these declarations teem with negatives. The authors were more concerned with stating what each Church or sect repudiated than what that Church accepted. Their tendency is therefore to accentuate our difference

and their study makes us feel what deep gulfs separate the various Christian bodies one from another.

Rationalism and the rapid growth of indifference to spiritual values has brought at least one blessing. It has compelled the Church of Christ to attempt to put her house in order once more. We seem to have begun to realize seriously the great danger we are in owing to our unhappy divisions and instead of seeking formulas to emphasize our differences we have begun to produce statements which enumerate points of agreement. Frankly there are an increasing number of young people who are growing sick of controversy about points of doctrine, who realize that there are varieties of religious experience, and, while sure of their own, see no need to deny other people's, and they are willing to allow others the right to use forms they find helpful without breaking Communion with them. They are anxious to show that the Church they belong to is comprehensive and therefore welcome any positive statement of belief which will help to bring together again all those who love their Lord in sincerity and truth and wish to serve Him.

The manifesto on Eucharistic Doctrine is therefore welcomed by them as an attempt to draw up a statement of what men of different schools of thought hold in common. It is drawn up on positive constructive lines. It therefore studiously avoids negations of any kind. Some may wish to emphasise one point more than another, others may wish to safeguard some clause against misinterpretation, but to do so would only endanger its usefulness as a means of drawing Christians together. The criticisms of this manifesto which have already appeared show that there are many who feel that the statement is inadequate, that some feature of the divine mystery has not been given in it the prominence it deserves; while there are others who, accepting its clauses, fear that without the express denial of what they have been brought up to regard as error it will do more harm than good. Those who are more interested in discovering points of difference than points of agreement are sure to give this document a cold reception. The Protestant and Catholic doctrines are poles asunder, what is the use of trying to reconcile the irreconcilable, they will ask. The same argument might be applied to Indian politics and yet it was found worth while to hold a Round Table Conference! A formula has been found which prominent individuals of all parties have agreed upon. That is in itself an accomplishment. Objection is now being raised in some quarters on the ground that the signatories are not representative of the parties to which they profess to belong, and that they sign as individuals. That is no doubt to some extent true, it could hardly be otherwise. They are men however whose names will carry considerable weight, whose scholarship is respected and whose desire to help the Anglican

Church to make her position as a Church clear is sincere. Those therefore who desire union, who want a statement of what Anglican Churchmen of every school of thought hold in common, cannot fail to welcome this honest attempt to make the sacrament of unity the rallying point. The fact that so many of every school of thought in the Anglican Church have been able to sign it is valuable proof that when suspicion and prejudice have been set aside there is a profound and substantial agreement amongst us, even in the highly contentious sphere of Eucharistic doctrine.

This fresh testimony to Anglican unity should therefore be welcomed by all who have the cause of union at heart and will, we hope, help forward the larger union for which it is the duty of every Christian to pray.

G. T. SELWYN,
Palamcottah.

The Eucharistic Doctrine

I am thankful to the Editor of *Church Union News and Views* for giving me the privilege of going through the series of resolutions on Eucharistic Doctrine signed by a large number of Anglicans, and expressing my views on them. I think that these resolutions are the outcome of the earnest desire on the part of these Anglican brethren to point out the fundamental principles underlying the Doctrine, which ought to be safeguarded and conserved in the future United Church of Christ in South India. We should sincerely appreciate their desire and sympathize with their standpoint, if that be the purpose of drafting these resolutions.

I have always felt that some of our non-Anglican Churches have yet to learn to celebrate the Lord's Supper with greater solemnity and reverence. In fact, we have yet to learn many things one from the other. It is this spirit of being ready to learn from one another, and share one another's experiences, that is going to count in the matter of establishing a truly united Church of God on solid foundations. In connection with the Eucharist, it is true, that we have to be careful so as to avoid all superstitions and idolatrous notions and practices. At the same time we should be eager to celebrate the Sacrament in such a manner as to ensure the appropriation of the richest possible divine blessings and spiritual uplift.

In reading through the carefully prepared resolutions over and over again, I must confess that in several places it is hard for me to follow in

detail and accept all the theological and doctrinal implications and inferences. I am not going to question the validity of the series of resolutions, as they are apparently based on personal experience and not simply on accepted creeds or articles of faith. But I will just point out what my emphasis would be, if I were to draw up a series of resolutions on the same doctrine. It is declared and rightly so, in the preamble that the Life of God the Son is a life of self-giving to the Father. I would rather emphasize the self-giving of God the Son to the Children of God who are in sin. Furthermore I would give greater prominence to Christ's work as a Saviour from sin rather than to His function as a priest. The terms like 'priest', 'sacrifice', 'redemption', are used by New Testament writers in figurative language to convey deep spiritual truths. The religion of the Hebrews, as we see in the Old Testament, is full of such figures and analogies. Priesthood stands for the human longing for one to stand between Man and God. Christ is the fulfilment of all priesthood and represents God to Man and Man to God and stands as the meeting point where reconciliation is accomplished. But the figure of priesthood should not be pressed too far and Christ ought not to be understood to be priest literally. All that the writer to the Hebrews means by the figure of perpetual priesthood is that Christ's work in uniting God and Man is abiding and eternal. The present activity of Christ in the Spiritual work is so far beyond our experience and imagination that we cannot positively build up our doctrines from figurative representations of the same, from which we get just glimpses of the Spiritual world.

There are various religious acts and influences that contribute to the strengthening of the divine life in us and making the presence of *Christ real* to us. Divine worship is one of them and the divine worship connected with the celebration of the Lord's Supper may be made so real as to be one of the most important means of grace or helps to the divine life. Some other helps to the divine life that may be mentioned in this connection are—prayer, communion with God, reading of the Scriptures and meditation on the same, and fellowship with good Christian friends. I just want to point out that there is a danger of these religious acts and influences becoming rather self-centred, formal and mechanical. Divine music, worship and sacraments may end in selfish enjoyment or temporary spiritual uplift. What we have to emphasize to Christians in these days is not only realizing the presence of Christ in our churches and cathedrals or prayer houses but also in our workshops, offices and homes. Realizing the daily presence of our Redeemer in all walks of life—helping us, cheering us up, sustaining and comforting us at all times. Christ has promised to be with us as a constant companion. Furthermore, we can find Christ as a real companion and fellow-worker in his vineyard. When we are working for His glory and serving mankind, He appears to

us as a real spiritual person working with us. These are more urgent and vital problems for us than doctrinal speculations about ordinances and rituals.

G. P. JAMES,
Pasumalai.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper

The Communion Service, as we now regard it, originated in a significant gesture on the part of Christ at the conclusion of the last supper that our Lord took with His disciples. Actions speak louder than words hence its effect when subsequent events might have caused the disciples to forget the words spoken by the Master. An act performed in the moment of high tension sticks in the mind and recurs under stimulus recalling the associations in which it occurred. Thus when Jesus 'Took bread and broke it' He left an indelible impression on the minds of all present, and 'As often' as they repeated the act they recalled vividly the whole setting with its implications. As they saw the scene once more and realised its meaning they could picture the Master Himself, Who declared Himself to be the Revealer of God. God became more real as they recalled Jesus' words 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father'.

The disciples continued the practice as begun by Jesus, solemnly observing the simple rite at the conclusion of the evening meal. Certain disorders crept in, which led the Apostle Paul to make the first written statement on the subject and to set this symbolic act in a place by itself. It was on the basis of Paul's instruction that the early Christian Church carried out the Sacrament and we seek to keep as close as possible to the practice of the Apostolic Church. It is worth noting that in the beginning the celebration was always in the evening not in the morning, before breaking fast.

In the Westminster Shorter Catechism, the question is asked 'What is the Lord's Supper'. To which the reply is 'The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament wherein by giving and receiving bread and wine, according to Christ's appointment, His death is shewed forth, and worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of His body and blood, with all the benefits to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace'. Such in brief is the position held by the Presbyterian Church. It is not regarded as mystical or magical in any sense but as symbolic in that the common elements are set apart to denote the broken body and shed blood of our Blessed Lord. The Clergy claim no

supernatural, miraculous or sacrificial powers. These 'Outward and visible' things make more vivid the 'Inner and Spiritual' significance of the great final act of our Lord's earthly life. The implications may be set forth under three heads:—

I. Commemoration: In the Sacrament we commemorate the life, teaching and unquenchable love of our Lord, which found its full manifestation in the giving of Himself on the Cross. We call to remembrance, not merely the death itself but what that death meant as a redemptive act. 'Once in the end of the age He appeared putting away sin by the sacrifice of Himself—There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin'. The sacrifice is not repeated but it is commemorated. 'This do' said Jesus, 'in remembrance of Me'. We do not merely listen to an exhortation, in a passive sense, but by an act of the will we take the elements and convey them to our lips thus definitely sealing our remembrance of 'Him, Who hath loved us'.

II. Communion: Christ Himself promised that 'Where two or three are gathered in My name, there am I in the midst'. Here is the real presence. Jesus, Himself, according to promise meets with those who thus remember Him by so definite an act as partaking of the Sacrament of His dying love. The table has been called the table of the Lord (not an altar rail) and it is His invitation that is repeated 'Eat ye all of it,—Drink ye all of it'.

'Here, O my Lord I see Thee face to face;
Here, do I touch and handle things unseen.'

The sacramental season is a time of real communion to many of the followers of Christ, as a fresh vision of the undying love of their Lord breaks upon their souls. It is also a time of communion with one's fellow believers as all meet on a common plane. False barriers break down before the common bond of sinners before God, recipients of His grace, participators in His blood bought pardon, the objects of His love, with no merit to plead but faith in the one Lord. We are thus 'All one in Christ Jesus'. It is an occasion for setting aside 'all bitterness and wrath and evil-speaking' and deepening the bond of Christian fellowship in the presence of the same Lord over all 'Who is rich toward all'.

III. Covenant: There is frequently some material token used as a guarantee of good faith between two who covenant together. A ring or some such object are symbols of the agreement. Hand clasps hand in friendship. Lip touches lip in the kiss of love. So as our hand clasps these sacramental objects we pledge ourselves by a definite act as friends of Jesus, accepting responsibility thereby. As our lips touch the sacred chalice, we impress the kiss which is the seal of love, the greatest declaration of all. Hands pledged to loyalty by handling the holy symbols

must not violate the vow by unworthy acts. Lips sanctified in the kiss of Love's covenant must remain unsullied. We are pledged by the most sacred of acts to live worthily and by word and deed to be more and more like our Lord, to seek the extension of His Kingdom and share with Him the great task of world's redemption. Our renewed obedience brings His assurance of His abiding presence, His unfailing grace, His inseparable love until He comes in fulfilment of His promise and we are transformed into His likeness when we shall see Him as He is'.

J. G. HALDANE,
Chingleput.

The Effect of Union on the Basis of the Proposed Scheme in the Madura Area

It is difficult to foresee in detail what may be the effect of such a union in any particular area. But the history of the past half century has shown that real union among Churches has been in the line of progress and the upbuilding of the Kingdom. We may expect this principle to apply here.

It is also difficult when considering this particular problem to keep one's eye off the map in an effort to visualize what it will mean to all our Churches to be a part of a communion covering practically all of South India with parts of Ceylon. Aside from the sentimental reason which appeals to one, more or less, according to his reaction to such sentiments, there will, I am sure, be many an outstanding advantage which can be foreshadowed at present. The sense of solidarity, the constant reaction of one part upon another and the ever-increasing economy not only in material things but in ideas and spiritual forces can now be mentioned with certainty though not measured with accuracy.

But to return to Madura. The geographical position of the Madura Church Council together with the very happy relations it has sustained for decades with its neighbour Churches cannot but exert a strong influence on its membership at the present time. To the east the former Mission of the S.P.G. in Ramnad with which the Madura Mission has worked on a definite basis of division of territory for two generations; the great Mission of the Church Missionary Society in Tinnevelly whose help and co-operation we have enjoyed from the day our Mission was founded; the Wesleyan fields in Trichinopoly, and Dharapuram from which we are constantly

drawing inspiration; the fields of the London Missionary Society both in Travancore and in the North Tamil area with which we made our first venture in union, and lastly the field of our mother Mission in Jaffna, Ceylon; each has a call to us to compose our differences and to stretch forth the hand of brotherhood 'that we all may be one'.

The South India United Church, more than perhaps any other part of the Churches concerned in the proposed scheme, has lived in an atmosphere of union; one may go a step farther and say that within the South India United Church, the Madura Church Council has visualized and moved toward union in general as no other part of the united Church has done. Twice during its history has the Madura Church Council revised its Constitution with its eye upon union. In the first place it was a union with the Wesleyan Church alone. Then, borrowing the thought of a speaker of that date, we tried to evolve 'a cosmos out of our chaos' to meet their requirements. In the second revision changes were made with special reference to the union which we are now considering. We do not have a Bishop, but we have an officer, whose duties are very similar to those of a constitutional Bishop so that very little change in the present organization of the Church Council would be required to bring it into harmony with the general provisions of the Scheme of Union along this particular line. An officer is also set apart to attend to the routine work on the administrative side. The Executive Secretary with a separate office establishment takes charge of this and thus leaves the Chairman free for the more directly spiritual side of the Council's work. While experience suggests that it may be found desirable in future to unite the offices of the Executive Secretary and of the Chairman for purposes of easy consultation and co-operation, the present plan has worked well, giving to the Chairman much more time than formerly to visit among the churches and come into direct touch with the pastors and their particular problems. Slight changes in the Constitution would make it possible to have one office staff in place of two as at present; and this may well be one of the changes that will be found desirable when union comes. Such a change will remove the necessity for a considerable volume of correspondence now carried on and will make it possible for the Executive Secretary further to relieve the Bishop-to-be of routine work and enable him to give a greater share of his attention to the truly spiritual leadership of the churches. The chairmanship of our Ministerial Committee—a Committee which deals with all questions relating to the Ministers, selection of candidates, recommendation for ordination, transfer, retirement, etc. and of the Life and Work Committee whose duty it is to keep its hand so far as possible upon the pulse of the churches, falls to the duties of the Chairman of the Council. Each involves a very considerable amount of correspondence which might be carried on by an Executive Secretary, if the offices were united.

Another change would be in the method of appointing the Chairman. This goes without saying, but is mentioned because the writer feels it of very considerable importance. It is to him a fact beyond a peradventure that an officer selected with a view to permanence and given a special rank and name will command more influence and, other things being equal, will exert a greater spiritual power in the churches than one who is elected for a year or two only. So though this change is involved in the scheme it should not pass unnoticed when speaking of the changes that will take place when the union is consummated. The writer can speak from personal experience in this respect and that experience has convinced him that he owes not a little of such influence as he may possess to the mere fact that he has held the office of Chairman for many years through constant re-election. It is not simply that experience has familiarised him with the problems and the personal equations involved, but these years have given him a position, quite apart from personal considerations, which he otherwise would not have. This I believe to be universally true and especially so in the Indian Church, and I am confident that this permanent tenure of office coupled with the definite setting apart for the work of that office will greatly enhance the influence and spiritual power of him, whoever he may be, who is called to the office of Bishop.

While we cannot yet definitely visualize the boundaries of the Diocese under the united Church, the changes will probably not be great in the Madura area. A few churches from the Anglicans may be added to the present numbers, or even all those in the Ramnad district may be added to the Madura Churches to form a diocese. But in this as in other respects the changes in the Madura area will not be such as materially to alter the character of our work.

In addition to the foregoing, there are possible changes that are feared by some, at least, in the South India United Church. These alleged changes reach to the very heart of the whole problem, so cannot be entirely unnoticed when considering the subject before us. It is well, therefore, to ask frankly such questions as the following:

Will the character of the churches be materially altered?

Will the freedom they possess be lost?

Will alien views and practices be forced upon them?

A careful study of the Scheme in all its bearings should, I feel sure, convince anyone that no belief and no ceremony or form affecting his private, or public, worship of God is forced upon any participant in the union. Room in the Church-to-be is designedly made for all who accept the Holy Scripture as 'containing all things necessary for salvation' and the two ancient creeds, the Apostolic and Nicene as 'witnessing to, and safeguarding the faith' and growing out of those Scriptures. It has, however, been specifically argued that after entering the union our churches will

no longer be 'Free Churches'. The reply to this depends entirely upon what is understood by the term a 'Free Church'. If our conception of such a church is an individual village or town congregation able to do as it wishes in any respect regarding its officers, its beliefs or forms of worship, we shall certainly not be a free church in the union; and in the Madura area, at least, there have never been Free Churches. If on the other hand we mean a Church made up of many individual congregations with room for all to worship as they wish, entirely independent of any outside authority and each able to develop along its own line as led by the Spirit of God and the skill and judgment of its membership, then I am convinced that we will continue to be as free a church as we are today. In any study of the Scheme it is most essential that we should keep in mind the object set before those who prepared it: a Church in which all can find a spiritual home and yet a Church in which none shall be compelled to believe a given interpretation of a teaching, on which the facts differ, or to conform to any particular mode of worship.

By far the most significant change of all is that through which, by a happy union of this freedom and inclusiveness, the walls of separation are broken down and all are brought together at the Table of the Lord. It has taken much effort to travel the road of union so far as we have. We may not be so near the end as some would think, but we have gone too far to turn back, and with the continued blessing and guidance of God the day will come when this vision of a great united Church for South India will be realized in rejoicing and a great quickening of spiritual power.

C. STANLEY VAUGHAN.

Book Reviews

Personal Problems of Conduct and Religion. (By J. G. McKenzie, M.A., B.D., Geo. Allen & Unwin Ltd., London. 5 *sh.*)

In this little book of 144 pages we have a volume free from any technical or theoretical discussions, but we have some very practical help about such problems as adolescence, new habits, temptation and Church going, regrets and fears, the delinquent child, the psychology of faith. The book is well worth the price for the very simple and helpful chapter on sleeplessness. In eight very simple pages the author gives us a conception of the causes of sleeplessness and their remedy so that anyone following his advice will overcome any tendency in this direction he may have. And so with all the book. It is exceedingly helpful because of its exceeding simplicity.

Mysticism, East and West. (By Rudolf Otto, Macmillan, N.Y. $3·50.)

Dr. Otto has given us another of his wonderfully illuminating books. These lectures were first of all delivered in Oberlin College on the Haskell Foundation and are in essence a comparison between the Mysticism of Eckhart on the one hand and that of Sankara on the other. The book is not easy to read, as none of Dr. Otto's books are, but for the student who is deeply interested in the philosophy of the East there is a wonderful revelation of the similarity between East and West in this question of Mysticism. The author chooses Master Eckhart of mediæval Germany as the Western exponent of Mysticism and Master Sankara of mediæval India as the Eastern representative. The book is divided into two parts, in the first of which the author demonstrates the contacts between Sankara and Eckhart and shows that even in the technical words which they use they are very similar. Both have much the same experience and use much the same vocabulary in attempting to discuss their experience. In the second half of the book, however, Dr. Otto shows with equal intelligence that there is a wide difference between the quest of the Westerner and the Easterner. While Sankarachariar teaches that we must escape from the snare and delusion of this world and lose our identity in the Supreme Being, Master Eckhart would have us make practical use of the knowledge that we have gained through our mystical experience and give ourselves to the transformation of this world and to the service of men. He holds practically the same theory that Schweitzer has enunciated in his lectures at Selly Oak where he frankly admits that Christianity is illogical and inconsistent, for it demands that the man who has been saved and united with the Infinite must then go back into the world and save others. This book will be a new means to help the student of the Eastern mind to get into a deeper realisation of the truth that lies at the base of all thinking. Dr. Otto has done us a real service in showing us that after all there is not the absolute difference between East and West that so many have laid down. The human mind is after all one the world over and throughout history, and therefore the genuinely deep experiences of the mind must be similar no matter where and when they take place.

Clippings

Reunion of Christendom

Principal Martin's Views

(From The Scotsman, Monday, December 14, 1931)

Lecturing on the Murtle Foundation in Aberdeen yesterday, Principal Martin took as his subject 'Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, and the South India Union Scheme.' It was on the mission field, he said that the most arresting union movements were to be seen to-day, and none was more significant than that now proposed in South India. The scheme bore its comprehensive aim and character stamped on the face of it. Neither Congregationalist nor Presbyterian could say that his claims had been overlooked; and that the Church of India, Burmah, and Ceylon, should be prepared to belong to a Communion so ordered and officered was a circumstance to which he supposed no modern parallel could be anywhere adduced. A governing condition of the scheme was to be the acknowledgment of the

Prinicipal Martin's Views—(*contd.*)

historic Episcopate as a working institution, no theory of its nature or of the sanctions on which it rested being required of any office-bearer or member of the Church. He did not wish to be understood as criticising the stipulation thus laid down—it might well be that union on any other terms would have been impossible. Yet the risks involved seemed clear. The difference of view covered was wide. Not even the studied definition offered at the recent Lambeth Conference need be expected to satisfy all; and the danger of friction under this head could hardly be thought unreal. No doubt the promoters of this union felt themselves justified in the course they were taking. They hoped gradually to 'grow together' into complete spiritual unity. The friendly onlooker could but sincerely desire that such faith and courage would be rewarded.

DIFFERENCE OF THEORY

Difference of theory seemed to be reflected in corresponding contrariety of practice. Thus under the head of jurisdiction an ultimate control appeared to be left to the Episcopate, while at the same time the Synod, composed of bishops, presbyters, and laymen, was described as the supreme governing and legislative body of the Church, and the final authority in all its concerns. This was recognised, however, as an important matter still awaiting final determination. With regard to ordination, again, this power was to be in the hands of the bishop alone, who for himself must be consecrated by at least three bishops, whether with or without the participation of presbyters appeared to be as yet uncertain. Continuity with the historic Episcopate would in this way be maintained. On those terms, would a non-episcopally ordained minister be admitted to the celebration of the Sacraments in the united Church? A recent amendment in the constitution seemed to be framed as to secure this, but only where such minister was invited to celebrate, and subject to the provisions of a pledge given for the protection of conscientious scruples. Here, then, a practical diversity appeared, the hope being that in due course full unity would be established. Doubtless the faith of all was in the truth that it would prevail.

EXCLUSIVENESS GIVING WAY

How did the South India scheme appear in Anglican eyes? The answer was important, especially for all who desired, as many of them would desire, to discover in the scheme the bridge which was to bring Presbyterianism and Episcopacy nearer to one another than they had been for centuries. In a real degree it was encouraging. The Lambeth Conference had found itself able almost to its own surprise to give a unanimous benediction to the proposals. And in the various admissions made and exceptions sanctioned exclusiveness was seen giving way. The Sacraments of non-Episcopal Churches were admitted by implication to be real Sacraments, and non-Episcopal Orders availed for their effective administration. At the same time they were warned against drawing precipitate conclusions here. The situation was governed by a principle of 'economy', and Lambeth cherished the confidence that a 'genuinely Catholic province of the Church would ultimately emerge. Further, general intercommunion was resolutely opposed, and the Episcopate was described as belonging to those points of Order which the Anglican held essential and for which he was bound to stand. The truth was that Anglicanism stood for the historic Episcopate so-called, but not for historical reasons only. Those were right, he feared, who said that a difference in their conception of the Church lay at the root of their differences here; and other and even profounder theological differences were involved also. Till an adjustment of these had been arrived at, would any mere unification of Church polity be either safe or wise?

NOT OBLIGED TO TAKE EXTREMISTS

He was far from wishing, however, to end upon a note of discouragement. They were not obliged to take the extremists on either side as typical, nor need they exaggerate their disagreements unduly. They were all under education in respect of the conditions on which the reunion of Christendom was to be reached and this South India scheme, as it moved on to its appointed end, could not but have further lessons to teach. He did not think anyone would say that the bridge was as yet complete, and the danger was that the more nearly it reached the shore on either side the more it might seem to be receding on the other. Nevertheless, the structure was abuilding, and who should say, what the final form of it would be? These men's eyes at least were upon the future. As one of the pioneers at that time, the Bishop of Madras had said, 'Our outlook must be on the future. Catholicism is a goal to which we are reaching forward.' That was an inspiring word, and to follow the guidance of the spirit and providence of God in labouring to build up the Kingdom in the present, amid all its anxieties and urgencies, and for the days to come, must ensure that manifest unity of heart and purpose which should lead the world to believe in the Church's Lord.

Intercommunion

The Free Church Position

By the Rev. Professor P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON, D.D.

(From The British Weekly)

It is with some hesitation that I agree to write on this subject at present. One main reason of this is that, as is well known, conversations—*quorum minima pars sum*—have been resumed at Lambeth between representatives of the Church of England and of the Free Churches; and it is, perhaps, undesirable that those who take part in these conversations should enter much into discussion elsewhere on questions which must come up in the joint conference. On the other hand, this subject interests a great many more than the small group who meet at Lambeth; it has been debated lately by many Anglicans, and it is only reasonable, therefore, that a Free Church view of it be stated; and no harm can be done if it is written of—even by a member of the joint conference—in the spirit not of controversy but of elucidation and enquiry. It is in this spirit that—at the Editor's request—I say a few things here.

I

In the first place, Free Churchmen are glad that this subject of Intercommunion has come to the front. We have urged its consideration from the early days of our first response to the Lambeth appeal of 1920 and on many occasions since. But we were always met with the reply, which is explicitly given in the official report of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, that 'this is the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union.' We never accepted that, because we were convinced that the facts spoke differently. To take but one concrete example, would the recent union in Scotland have had the ghost of a chance of achievement if, till 'the restoration of union' had been reached, the doors to the Communion Table in the one church had been locked against the members of the other? We are glad, therefore—for the sake of the furtherance of unity, as well as for the far more sacred sake of sacramental fellowship in itself—that this *cliché* about the 'goal' has been abandoned, as clearly it has been in the agreement with the Old Catholic churches with which union has not been consummated but with which intercommunion has been sanctioned.

I venture to add that the Free Churches heartily congratulate the Church of England on the first step in its reformed history by which it enters into Communion with any other body. Hitherto, the Anglican Church has been in a strange position in relation to the rest of Christendom. It recognised churches, but they did not recognise it; certain other churches recognised it, but these it did not recognise. One could not help wondering, if this were catholicity, what is isolation? Now, however, with the agreement about intercommunion with the Old Catholics—and also with the Orthodox acceptance of Anglican orders—this era of 'catholic isolation' is passing away; and on this, as I have said, the Church of England may be congratulated. The one isolated catholic church in Christendom to-day is Rome.

II

In the next place, Free Churchmen naturally look to see how this argument with the Old Catholics bears on the question of intercommunion between the Church of England and the Free Churches. The Bishop of Gloucester, who has carried this business through with marked ability, said in Convocation that here is 'an admirable model of what they should aim at in all attempts at intercommunion.' Well, what is this model? Its terms are few and simple. Each communion 'recognises' the other as independent and catholic, and agrees to admit the other's members to participation in the Sacraments; and this is added:

'Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith.'

This kind of agreement is entirely acceptable to Free Churchmen and, certainly, there is in it material for Anglicans and Free Churchmen to work upon. We have done a good deal towards recognising each other even Free Church ministers of the Word and Sacraments having been recognised as 'in the Universal Church.' As to faith I have never heard it questioned on either side that the other did not hold 'the essentials of the Christian faith.' (Episcopacy, it hardly need be said, is not of faith but is a question of order.)

It is to be hoped, further, that this will be done not only in a select joint-committee at Lambeth but much more generally. For if one thing is becoming clear about union, it is that it must concern itself with the drawing together of the people of the Churches and not merely or even mainly the clergy. The problem of union at present is less the planning in detail of the architecture of the Church of the future, which lies, so to speak, across the river of our separations, than the building of the bridge across the river. Now,

The Free Church Position—(*contd.*)

in the past, we have spent a good deal of time trying to make a bridge for our respective ministries. Something has been done; but a thoroughfare has not been established. We shall do well if—while, of course, not giving up the other effort—we set about trying to make a bridge by which the Christian peoples of our separated churches could more often meet each other. Here the question of intercommunion should not and must not be shirked.

III.

I add only a word or two on the matter of the Bishops' proposals for governing the occasional admission of Nonconformists to Holy Communion in Anglican churches. The Bishops were disposed to sanction this where a non-Anglican, being baptised, had no church of his own denomination to go to; also in schools and colleges; also on special occasions of joint religious effort or intercourse. The Lower House of Convocation thought these proposals so serious that they got a special committee—largely of 'theological experts'—to consider them. And there the matter stands for the present. One does not want to say anything which might make a favourable result more difficult; for, certainly, any other result would react very unhappily on relations between Anglicanism and the Free Churches. All I shall say is that the ruling principle here is that this is the Lord's table, not ours—not the Anglicans', nor the Presbyterians', nor anyone else's. People easily admit this in words; but there is many a mind—especially many a clerical mind—into which it has not really entered. The frequent use in this connection of the word 'hospitality' is a symptom of this. The Lord is host at His own table; and our relation to it is simply that of His servants. Therefore all 'domestic' regulations—such as the Anglican rubric about confirmation, or these proposals of the Bishops (which strike one as geographical rather than religious), or any other—must be kept subordinate. What I desire to see is the doors of access to the Lord's table unlocked in His name to all who are credibly of His Church on earth. (Of course, anyone habitually going to a particular church should accept its domestic rules.) I desire this, first, because it is in accord with His invitation Whose the table is and with the meaning of the sacrament of 'the body of Christ'; but, also and secondly, because I am certain—those who say the contrary surely do not speak from experience in the achievement of unions—that this, more almost than anything else, would bring unity into sight.

Here, for the present and with these intentionally incomplete remarks, I leave this serious question; adding only that on the result of the handling of it depends a great deal in the prospects of the whole matter of union or unity between the Church of England and the Free Churches.

Resumed Conversations at Lambeth

(The British Weekly)

We welcome very heartily the resuming of conversations between representatives of the Church of England and representatives of the Free Churches. These, we believe, have been opened under the very best auspices, the auspices of a truly serious and friendly intention. It is betraying no confidence, because it is something with regard to which it ought to be a matter of pride and gratitude, that responsible people in the Church of England are aware that the references at last year's Lambeth Conference betrayed a reticence and aloofness which puzzled the other churches. We are happy to know that that small cloud which might have covered the sky has been entirely dissipated.

There are only two observations we would presume to make. One is that on both sides any decisions arrived at must, of course, be submitted to the supreme courts of the several churches. When that comes to be done, it should be done with every appearance of a serious and hopeful purpose. Communications should not be confined to written documents. They should be accompanied and enforced by the living voice of the most influential men in the churches of the land.

The second thing is something that lies still deeper. There will be no Union between churches except on a basis of humble confession before God that churches *need* one another; and that as we are, and apart, we have gravely failed. Miguel de Unamuno was only saying with incomparable eloquence what may be the sober truth of the whole matter when he declared that 'a *Miserere* sung in public by us all' might be the swiftest way of restoring God to the public mind.

Independents and Reunion

To The Editor of The Christian World

Sir,—At the recent meetings of the Congregational Union in Manchester Dr. Micklem urged us to support 'the attempts made by earnest men to draw the Church into closer unity. Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon, on the other hand, referring to the resumed conferences between the Federal Council of the Free Churches and the Archbishops, said, 'The time has come when we must put an end once and for all to this flirtation which cannot lead to marriage.' The issue thus sharply defined must be faced by us all in the near future. It seems to me that it would be useful if those of us who are clear in our minds about it would say so. Will you therefore allow me to range myself with Dr. Micklem in looking forward to the time—and no distant time—when we of the Independent tradition shall bear our witness within a reunited Church, and in recognising with him that the gulf between us and other communions is really less than we often try to persuade ourselves. The problem of reunion is admittedly difficult; it should not be insoluble, if we really feel the shame of adding to the divisions of this distressful world; if we really want to stand with our fellow Christians in the time of trial through which the whole Church is passing. The sectarian type of religion of which Mr. Gibbon made himself the spokesman has no longer, I believe, a future, and I for one have neither part nor lot in it.—

Yours,
C. H. DODD

Manchester

OUTSTANDING VALUES!

PRECISION THERMOMETERS

"SURGICO" BEST MAKE

Made of special *Normal-Glass*, triangular magnifying lenses and clear, distinct and easily read black figures. Self-registering in ½ minute. 'Shakedown' easily. Passed the most exacting and severe tests. Sold with a printed guarantee as to *accuracy* and *reliability*. Used in several hospitals in India. In Nickel case with pocket clip, As. **14** each. Rs. **10** per dozen. In screwed coloured Vulcanite case, with pocket clip, Re. **1-4** each, Re. **14-4** per dozen.

"SR" Adhesive Plasters. Zinc Oxide. In airtight containers. Very useful and lasting quality. Pocket or trunk size. For cuts, wounds, etc. In spools 5 yards long.

Width, 1 1½ 2 3 ins.
Rs. 9 12 15 21 per doz.

Hospital size Rolls. 12 inches wide, 5 yards long, **Re. 1-8** each.

Physician or Household size Rolls. One yard long, 7 inches wide, **Re. 1-8** each.

Write for Literature.

Goodrich Hot Water Bottles. Best for the Indian climate. Long-lasting, durable and fast-selling.
2 quarts **Rs. 3-4** each.
3 ,, **Rs. 3-8** ,,

Do. With Douche Combined, complete. 2 quarts, **Rs. 5-8** each.

Infants' or Face Hot Water Bottles, one pint, **Rs. 2-4** each.

Goodrich special list sent *free*. It contains many useful rubber products for home, dispensary and hospital use.

Leading House for Surgical Instruments & Hospital Requisites

Manufacturers of Hernia Trusses, Abdominal Belts and Orthopedic Appliances,

BOMBAY SURGICAL CO., New Church Road, BOMBAY, 4.

Telegrams: 'SURGICO'. **Telephone No. 41936.**

THOS. COOK & SON, LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND.)

IN CO-OPERATION WITH

WAGONS-LITS CO.

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

PASSAGES engaged by all lines at same fares as charged by Steamship Companies. Holders of COOK'S tickets met at all ports. Outward passages engaged and tickets supplied from any part of the World to India. Usual reductions obtained for Missionaries, Railway Officials, Families, etc.

BAGGAGE received, stored and forwarded. Cargo shipped to all parts of the World at current rates. Inward consignments such as Hardware, Piecegoods, Machinery, Stores, etc., for Messes and Clubs, cleared and forwarded at special rates. Insurances of all kinds effected on Baggage, Cargo, Livestock, Mess Property, etc.

THE ORIENTAL TRAVELLERS' GAZETTE containing sailing dates and fares of all steamers, together with invaluable information for travellers, sent post free on application.

GOVERNMENT CERTIFICATES accepted. No deposit required.

THOS. COOK & SON (BANKERS), LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND.)

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

CURRENT AND FIXED DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS opened. Interest allowed. Pay and Pensions collected, Periodical remittances made at current rates. Insurances premia paid.

LETTERS OF CREDIT AND TRAVELLERS' CHEQUES issued, encashable throughout the World.

DRAFTS granted and TELEGRAPHIC TRANSFERS effected on all principal towns.

INSURANCE Life, Accident, Fire, Burglary, effected. Prospectus on application.

---

300 Offices throughout the World.

EASTERN OFFICES: BAGHDAD, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, COLOMBO, DELHI, MADRAS, RANGOON, SIMLA, and SINGAPORE.

Madras Office 1-35 Mount Road.

Telegraphic Address: "COUPON"

Printed and published for the Christian Literature Society by the Diocesan Press, Madras, 1932